

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. Contract Number		Page of Pages 1 4		
2. Amendment/Modification Number 0003		3. Effective Date SEE BLOCK 16C		4. Requisition/Purchase Request No. RQ335859		5. Solicitation Caption OAG-CSSD Feasibility Study	
6. Issued By: Office of Contracting and Procurement Office of the Chief Technology Officer 441 - 4th Street, N.W., Suite 930 South Washington, DC 20001				7. Administered By (If other than line 6)			
8. Name and Address of Contractor (No. Street, city, country, state and ZIP Code)  ALL PROSPECTIVE OFFERORS				<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column;"> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. Amendment of Solicitation No. DCTO-2007-R-0067</div> <div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9B. Dated (See Item 11) 14-Jun-07</div> <div>10A. Modification of Contract/Order No.</div> <div>10B. Dated (See Item 13)</div> </div>			
Code		Facility					
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended. <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or fax which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or fax, provided each letter or telegram makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If Required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A. This change order is issued pursuant to: (Specify Authority) The changes set forth in Item 14 are made in the contract/order no. in item 10A.							
<input type="checkbox"/> B. The above numbered contract/order is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) set forth in item 14, pursuant to the authority of 27 DCMR, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2.							
<input type="checkbox"/> C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to authority of:							
<input type="checkbox"/> D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)							
<b>E. IMPORTANT:</b> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.							
14. Description of amendment/modification (Organized by UCF Section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)							
1. In Block 9 of the Solicitation, Offer and Award form, as amended, the date set for receipt for proposals is changed from Wednesday, July 18, 2007, 2:00 pm to Friday, July 20, 2007, 2:00 pm. 2. Amendment 0003 is issued to respond to questions received by potential offerors, attached. 3. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item (9A or 10A) remain unchanged and in full force and effect							
15A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or print)				16A. Name of Contracting Officer Steven H. Wishod			
15B. Name of Contractor		15C. Date Signed		16B. District of Columbia		16C. Date Signed  7/13/2007	
(Signature of person authorized to sign)				(Signature of Contracting Officer)			

**RFQ 335859 Questions and Responses**  
**DC OAG Feasibility Study RFP**  
**DCTO-2007-R-0067**

1. Is a copy of the DCCSES Technical Assessment that was performed in August 2002 available for distribution? No.
2. Can CSSD provide any additional requirements or system documentation regarding the various systems that are to integrate with the DCCSES? All the systems to be integrated with the DCCSES are included in the OAG CSSD enterprise architecture diagrams. The HHS guidelines also indicate the systems to be considered for integration with the CSES.
3. Can you provide sample copies of the reports generated by the Checkbook Module? This feasibility study is not expected to involve design issues like the above, so such sample reports are irrelevant.
4. Are copies of the Life of a Case PowerPoint slides and the accompanying Word documents containing the Task Lists, Case Ownership, and Diaries overview information available for distribution? No. Again, such detail is not required in the proposals for a feasibility study.
5. How many potential candidates for the alternative analysis has CSSD identified? How comprehensive is the list and can CSSD share any candidate details? Offerors should use their best judgment in formulating proposals that best meet the requirements of the solicitation.
6. Do the Estimated Completion Dates in the milestone table represent calendar or business days? For example, is the completion of the Request for Proposal expected approximately 12 weeks after the Award or 18 weeks after the Award? All dates are calculated in calendar days.
7. DC OCTO has established Enterprise Architecture standards to describe the relationships between Business, Information, Application, and Infrastructure architecture views. In addition to conforming to the HHS/ACF Feasibility guidelines, will this project also be required to conform to OCTO's Enterprise Architecture standards? Yes.
8. Is the CSSD currently considering standardizing data exchanges across the various related systems according to any national standards? For example, the Global Justice (GJXDM) standards may be applicable to the Corrections and Court Services system interfaces. Please list any standards that are being considered. These standards are issues that the feasibility study is expected to address. Offerors should use their best judgment in formulating proposals that best meet the requirements of the solicitation.
9. Will DC consider alternative pricing approaches other than fixed price? No.

10. Has a budget for this phase of the project been established and can it be shared? Budget estimates are not routinely disclosed to potential offerors in order to promote adequate competition.
11. Given the proposal extension, when can the project realistically be expected to start? By mid August.
12. The table in Section F.2.2, Period of Performance, page 19, shows that the primary project deliverables are to be completed within 90 days of award. Our experience indicates that these projects take from 12 to 18 months to complete. Will the District entertain project schedules significantly greater than your preliminary estimates? No. This feasibility study involves no design work. Offerors should plan an allocation of resources that can accomplish the required timeline.
13. Section L.17.2, page 44, reads, "If the Offeror is a corporation or partnership and does not provide a copy of its license, registration, or certification to transact business in the District of Columbia, the offer shall certify its intent to obtain the necessary license..." If we include a statement in our transmittal letter that we intend to obtain any necessary licenses, is this sufficient certification? Yes.
14. Attachment J.03, the Tax Certification Affidavit, requires a copy of FR-532 (Notice of Registration) or FR-500 (Combined Registration form). Is one of these forms sufficient to fulfill the requirement in Section L.17.2 for a District of Columbia Registration? The tax certification affidavit is usually sufficient unless the offeror has never done business in the District of Columbia. The Office of Tax and Revenue will ask for Form FR-500 if the offeror is not registered to conduct business in the District of Columbia.
15. What is the budget the District has allocated for this project? Budget estimates are not routinely disclosed to potential offerors in order to promote adequate competition.
16. Given the complexity of the response required, would the Office of Contracting and Procurement extend the Proposal Due-Date by several weeks to a month, for example until July 27, 2007? Amendment 0002 was issued extending the proposal due date until Wednesday, July 18, 2007. Amendment 0003 extends the proposal due date until Friday, July 20, 2007 and responds to these questions.
17. Is Section B.2: Price Schedule the pricing sheet to be completed and included in the "Price Proposal?" Yes. Please be sure to separate the price proposal from the technical proposal.
18. Considering the need to review existing DC documentation and systems, conduct site visits, evaluate at least three alternatives, and draft both an RFP and IAPD, the suggested timeline seems aggressive. Is the District open to a longer duration for the completion of the milestones listed in this section? This project must be completed within this fiscal year; therefore, the time periods established remain unchanged.

19. The Milestone Schedule in Section F.1.1 calls for deliverables due from five to 90 days post award. However, the RFP states that the contract term is three years. Please clarify what deliverables are due by when. After the RFP is released, how does the District plan to use staff associated with this contract? Will our involvement continue or will we "stand down" until the implementation vendor is selected? If we continue, please provide information on what services and deliverables will be required. All defined deliverables are due during the feasibility study (Phase I). The remaining hours are project management hours only; it is the District's intent for the consultant to provide the District expert advice/opinion during the selection of the Phase II design and development contractor and during the execution of that contract, including facilitating status meetings, and ensuring compliance with project tasks/deliverables to achieve a result consistent with the project goal.
20. Will the same person(s) with the requested qualifications be needed to facilitate meetings and provide expert advice [during Phase II]. How would the contractor propose for this time period when it sounds like it will be provided on an ad-hoc basis versus consistent? Proposers should suggest the spacing of status meetings during Phase II, and propose a fixed budget for this project management work. It is highly desirable that this project management staff include staff from the feasibility study. The District government would need to approve a staffing that involves totally new staff.
21. Given that the Year Two and Year Three responsibilities and associated deliverables are somewhat open ended, how does the District want these items addressed in this proposal? Should these years and estimated services be priced for in this proposal? If so, is a Time and Materials approach acceptable? See the answer to Question 20.
22. Section I.1.1 states that: The Standard Contract Provisions for Use with District of Columbia Government Supplies and Services Contracts dated November 2004 ("SCP"), are incorporated as part of the contract resulting from this solicitation. Will the Office of Contracting and Procurement consider suggested revisions and/or additions to these provisions? If yes, how should these suggestions be made? The current Standard Contract Provisions included in the solicitation (March 2007 version) will apply in their entirety, without revision or alteration.
23. Section L.21.1.2. Team qualifications states that: "(a) The Offeror is proposing a team with demonstrated experience with the technical platform". Please clarify the target technical platform for which we must demonstrate experience. Again, this area needs to be clarified in the statement of work. A platform shall be determined as appropriate to the results of the study. In other words, the study's outcome should include the most appropriate platform for the alternatives presented, and the proposed team should have the flexibility to apply the appropriate expertise to consider the significant alternatives.